REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending in this application. In an Office Action mailed May 22, 2008 ("OA"), the Examiner rejected claims 1-49. With this response, Applicants amend claims 1 and 23 for clarification only and not for purposes of overcoming the cited art. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

In addition, Applicants do not necessarily agree with or acquiesce to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the prior art, even if those characterizations are not addressed herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-28, 30-40, and 42-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0092004 A1 ("Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To properly reject a claim based on anticipation, an examiner must establish that a single prior art reference discloses, either expressly or inherently, "each and every element as set forth in the claim." MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, for Lee to be a proper reference, it must disclose "translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the translation code, transmitting the translated data from the server to the client; transmitting a change of the data format from the client **to the server** in a data object definition message; and automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of the data object definition message" (emphasis

added), as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Lee fails to disclose each and every limitation of this claim.

To reject claim 1, the Examiner appears to equate the server recited in the "translating data" element of claim 1 with Lee's designer computer 12, OA at page 16, and the client of the "transmitting the translated data" element with Lee's production user computer 22. OA at page 2. Following this logic, Lee then fails to disclose "transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message," as is also recited in claim 1, because Lee fails to disclose transmitting a change of the data format from production user computer 22 to designer computer 12 in a data object definition message. The production user computer 22 appears to be used by the system users. Lee at 41:16-21. But according to the Examiner and based on Applicants' understanding of Lee, these systems users do not appear to "[transmit] a change of data format ... in a data object definition message" from the production user computer 22 to design computer 12.

Further, by equating the client in claim 1 with Lee's production user computer 22, the Examiner's arguments appear to be inconsistent because the Examiner also equates Lee's design database 30—not Lee's production user computer 22—with the claimed client as well. *See* OA at page 16. Even if the client in claim 1 is equated with Lee's design database 30, and not production user computer 22, Lee still fails to disclose transmitting a change of the data format from design database 30 to designer computer 12 in a data object definition message.

For all the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee fails to disclose all elements set forth in claim 1. For at least these reasons, and the reasons set forth in

the previous Response to Office Action dated February 26, 2008, Applicants

respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Lee.

Independent claims 23 and 45 include language similar to that provided in claim

1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23 and 45 are patentable over

the Lee for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-18, 20-22, 24-28, 30-40, 42-44, and 46-49 depend on at

least one of independent claims 1, 23, and 45 and are patentable over Lee for at least

the same reasons as independent claims 1, 23, and 45.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0010753 A1

("Salter"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 depend on at least one of independent claims 1 and 23.

As shown in the analysis above, claims 1 and 23 are patentable over Lee. Salter fails to

overcome the deficiencies of Lee. Salter discloses converting markup language files

from one format to another. Salter at 0001:1-4. But Salter, like Lee, fails to disclose or

suggest "translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the

translation code, transmitting the translated data from the server to the client;

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object

definition message," as recited in claim 1 or in the similar language of claim 23.

Therefore, Lee in view of Salter fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent

claims 1 and 23. Because claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 depend on at least one of claims 1

15

and 23, claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 are patentable over either Lee in view of Salter for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 23.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 15, 2008   By: _____
                                            Aaron J. Capron
                                            Reg. No. 58,170
                                            (650) 849-6680

Filed via EFS-WEB

16